

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3, and 4 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-4 are currently pending and under consideration in the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-4 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY CAO ET AL. (USP# 6,295,396 B1)

The present invention as recited in claim 1 (as amended herein), relates to “[a]n optical demultiplexer, comprising: a dispersion compensator to receive multiplexed light and to disperse the received multiplexed light at a predetermined dispersion value; a first reflecting and transmitting device, coupled to an end of the dispersion compensator which does not receive the multiplexed light, to reflect light having a specified wavelength and to transmit light having a wavelength other than the specified wavelength so as to demultiplex the wavelength light from the multiplexed light, wherein the light having the specified wavelength, which is reflected by the first reflecting and transmitting device and is a part of the multiplexed light, passes through the dispersion compensator again.”

Cao teaches an optical arrangement for providing dispersion slope compensation to a received dispersion distorted input signal comprising NxM wavelength multiplexed channels.

However, nothing in the Cao references teaches, “wherein the light having the specified wavelength, which is reflected by the first reflecting and transmitting device and is a part of the multiplexed light passes through the dispersion compensator again” as recited in claim 1.

Similar to claim 1, Cao does not teach, “said light having the specified wavelength being reflected by the optical filter to pass through the dispersion compensator again” as recited in claim 3. Cao also fails to teach, “said light having the specified wavelength being reflected through the filtering unit to pass by the dispersion compensator at least two times so as to demultiplex the wavelength from a multiple wavelength light again” as recited in claim 4.

According to the above, it is submitted that Cao does not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 1-4 of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 6-14-05

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501